



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,042	07/03/2001	Rudolf Valenta	1614-0251P	5581

2292 7590 05/19/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

NOLAN, PATRICK J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1644

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/897,042	Applicant(s) Valenta et al.	
	Examiner Patrick J. Nolan	Art Unit 1644	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
Status			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Feb 28, 2003</u>			
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL.		2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, and 14-27</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above, claim(s) <u>8, 9, 14-20, 23, and 24</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.			
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1, 2, 4, 6, 21, and 22</u> is/are rejected.			
7) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>5 and 25-27</u> is/are objected to.			
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.			
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some* c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.			
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
Attachment(s)			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____	
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____		6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, and 14-27.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2-28-03 has been entered.
3. Claims 8-9, 14-20, and 23-24 stand withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
4. Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 21-22 and 25-27 are under consideration in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 6,025,152. (A), newly cited.

The '152 patent teaches a non-anaphylactic fragment of Feld1, a known allergen that has no IgE binding activity but has IgG binding activity in rats, see example 22, in particular, wherein said fragment is recombinantly produced and contains a carrier.

The prior art teachings anticipate the claimed invention.

Claim rejections 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at

Art Unit: 1644

the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 6 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent 6,025,152 in view of U.S. Patent 4,269,764, and U.S. Patent 6,126,939, both of record.

The '152 patent have been discussed supra. The claimed invention differs from the prior art teachings by using a polymerized allergen that has a peptide linker that is hydrophilic. However, the '764 patent teaches that polymerization of allergens produces immunogenic allergens that have markedly reduced allergenicity (column 1-2, in particular). The markedly reduced allergenicity of the polymerized allergen would have the expected property of being non-anaphylactic, since a heightened allergic response is a prerequisite of allergen mediated anaphylaxis and, the '939 patent teaches immunogens comprising polymers of peptides linked by a hydrophilic oligopeptide linker (i.e. "a short stretch of alanine residues" which are hydrophilic) to treat or ameliorate inflammation associated with allergic reactions; see column 9, paragraphs 2-4; and column 11, paragraph 2 in particular).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to polymerize the Fel-d1 allergen, as taught by the '152 patent because polymerized allergens show reduced allergenicity as taught by the '764 patent and use peptide linkers to polymerize a protein using hydrophilic amino acids, as taught by the '939 patent because the polymerized allergens linked by hydrophilic amino acids show reduced allergenicity as taught by the '939 patent. From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole is prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references.

8. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim depends upon a canceled claim. Correction is required.

9. Claims 5 and 25-27 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected claims.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Nolan whose telephone number is (703) 305-1987. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:30 am to 4:30 pm.

Art Unit: 1644

11. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan, can be reached at (703) 305-3973. The FAX number for our group, 1644, is (703) 305-7939. Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Pat J. Nolan
Patrick J. Nolan, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner, Group 1640
5/17/03